UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-NINTH YEAR

2509th MEETING: 4 JANUARY 1984

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2509) 1

Opening statement by the President 1

Adoption of the agenda 1

Complaint by Angola against South Africa:
Letter dated 1 January 1984 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16244) 1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2509th MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 4 January 1984, at 4 p.m.

President: Mr. Javier CHAMORRO MORA (Nicaragua).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, Egypt, France, India, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Peru, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Upper Volta, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2509)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. Complaint by Angola against South Africa:
   Letter dated 1 January 1984 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16244)

The meeting was called to order at 4.35 p.m.

Opening statement by the President

1. The PRESIDENT: [*interpretation from Spanish*]: Since this is the first meeting of the Council this year, I should like to extend my congratulations to everyone here today. I wish you good health and voice the hope that your fruitful work, characterized by the spirit of co-operation, will be in the interest of international peace and security for all mankind.

2. I am particularly pleased to welcome the new non-permanent members of the Council elected for a two-year term—Egypt, India, Peru, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Upper Volta. I know that I am reflecting the sentiments of the other members of the Council in expressing the conviction that the participation of the new members in the Council's work will be an invaluable contribution to the search for solutions to the complex problems with which the Council will have to deal in the discharge of its important functions.

3. I should like also, on behalf of the Council, to express my thanks to the retiring non-permanent members for the important and valuable contributions that they have made to our work. The representatives of Guyana, Jordan, Poland, Togo and Zaire have won our esteem and friendship and brought their talent to the Council's work in various ways. I am sure that our co-operation in the future will continue to be fruitful.

4. Before I conclude, I should like, on behalf of the Council, to express my grateful thanks to my predecessor, Mr. Max van der Stoel, the representative of the Netherlands, who conducted the proceedings of the Council most effectively during the month of December. Mr. van der Stoel won our enthusiastic admiration for his diplomatic skill displayed during the course of our work.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Complaint by Angola against South Africa:
Letter dated 1 January 1984 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16244)

5. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Spanish*]: I should like to inform the members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Angola, Ethiopia, Mozambique, South Africa, Togo, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia, in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Seifu (Ethiopia), Mr. Dos Santos (Mozambique), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Amega (Togo), Mr. Rupia (United Republic of Tanzania) and Mr. Lusaka (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

6. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Spanish*]: The Security Council is meeting today in response to the request which appears in a letter dated 1 January from the representative of Angola to the President of the Security Council.

7. I should also like to draw the attention of members of the Council to document S/16245, containing the text of a letter dated 31 December 1983 from the representative of Angola to the Secretary-General.

8. The first speaker is the representative of Angola, upon whom I now call.

9. Mr. de FIGUEIREDO (Angola): Mr. President, although I come here on a tragic mission, my mind is easier knowing that the Council's deliberations are being presided over by a staunch defender of freedom and national liberation. The role played by your country as a beacon in the struggle against neo-colonialism and imperialism is a source of consolation to us in our dark hour.

10. I should also like to extend, on behalf of my Government and delegation, our appreciation to the Secretary-General for his unceasing efforts, official and otherwise, to secure the withdrawal of South African troops from Angola and for his support of Angola's just calls.

11. As this is the third time within a few weeks that I have taken the floor in the Council, I run the risk of sounding tedious and repetitious. In southern Africa armed aggression, the butchery of civilians, State terrorism and economic sabotage, murder, kidnapping and rape have all become so commonplace that representatives may well ask: What else is new?

12. The fact that the majority of the acts I have just mentioned are aimed at one country and people, Angola, and that they are perpetrated by one entity, the racist régime of South Africa, simply serves to make the issue that much more of a repetition.

13. Nevertheless, no matter how blasé the audience, each death is a fresh catastrophe on the battlefields of Angola; each kidnapping and rape is a major trauma for the victim and the family; each racist act of sabotage is a setback in our efforts for national reconstruction; each act of racist aggression is a human and national disaster.

14. Matters of peace-keeping and security, with which the Council is charged under the Charter of the United Nations, are not entities in and of themselves, devoid of their human aspect. In fact, all the purposes and principles of the Charter, the *raison d'être* of the United Nations and all its organs, all the work ordinary and extraordinary carried out by the United Nations —all these have and must have as their central purpose and goal the human being. Yet this is too often forgotten under the mounds of paperwork and rhetoric of which the Organization is often rightly accused.

15. The Council in particular has a tendency indeed to deal with weighty issues of international significance as if these, and not the human factor, were the aim of the exercise; and buried beneath all the words and resolutions, the bickering and the negotiations, the acrimony and the debates, are real, living human beings, the victims of disasters which are being discussed in these halls and chambers.

16. Therefore, in our debate on the present issue, the Angolan mother who weeps for her sons slain by the racist fire, the Angolan parents whose children are raped by South African soldiers and then kidnapped or murdered, the poor peasants whose life's savings and meagre property are destroyed by racist troops, the Angolans who daily are subjected to artillery and aerial bombings—these are at the heart of problems of international peace and security in our region.

17. Instead, the Council's deliberations are focused on strategic concerns and considerations: what price peace and for whom?

18. The anguish of the Angolan people is matched —no, exceeded—by the cynicism of the racist régime. Even as the Council heard the views and appeals of the Government and people of Angola just two weeks ago [*2504th to 2508th meetings*], the racist régime hurriedly addressed a letter to the Secretary-General with an "offer" of "disengagement" to begin on 31 January [*see S/16219, annex I*]. Before my Government could even begin to study this "offer" to determine its genuineness, perhaps to seek clarification on certain points, we received an answer to our unspoken questions, a confirmation of our unvoiced suspicions.

19. Even as the Council had placed before it the letter of the racist authorities, even as Pretoria's friends and allies were pointing to the letter with pious satisfaction, even as the letter attempted, unsuccessfully, to diffuse the solid international support for the Angolan position by its spurious "offer" of "disengagement", the South African armed forces were fortifying their military positions inside Angolan territory, where they have been in illegal occupation since 1981.

20. Then began a series of military moves by the South African armed forces farther north of their positions inside Angolan territory. Their acts of armed aggression, including aerial bombing, strafing and rocket attacks, artillery bombings, ambush, mine detonations, and so on, were aimed at localities more than 200 kilometres from the Namibian border. This gives the lie to the racist assertion that South African troops would engage in operations only against Namibian freedom fighters. The families of thousands of Angolan victims can refute these lies.

21. A partial list of South African acts of aggression, which are continuing to this day, is before the Council members as an annex[1] to a letter addressed to the Secretary-General by President José Eduardo Dos Santos [*S/16245*].

22. Between March 1976 and August 1981, the racist armed forces of South Africa carried out 2,988 detected and counted acts of aggression against Angola, ranging from airspace violations to wholesale slaughter as at Cassinga and Bomba. In July 1981, the racist régime massed 40,000 troops on the Namibian border and began "Operation Protea", which led to the illegal occupation since 1981 of parts of southern Angola. Since that date, the racist troops have carried out countless acts of aggression against the Government and people of Angola from inside Angolan territory. Hence I am

not even attempting to compile a list of such acts since mid-1981 to the present. In any case, these figures cannot even begin to convey the true scale and tragedy of the human, economic, social and civil consequences of these relentless military operations against Angola.

23. This latest operation, carried out against old and new Angolan targets and from inside Angolan territory, is one of the largest such operations carried out by the racist armed forces, using Mirage fighter aircraft, motorized infantry brigades, four 140-mm and 155-mm artillery guns, 100 fighter aircraft and helicopters, AML-90 and AML-60 armoured cars and MX tanks. The sophisticated military arms and arsenals at the disposal of the South African armed forces are available through direct and indirect military assistance—in contravention of the Council's embargo on arms sales to South Africa—by Pretoria's Western friends and some allies, many of which are permanent or rotating members of the Council and some of which are represented at the Council table. Nevertheless, the valiant People's Armed Forces for the Liberation of Angola (FAPLA) have honourably defended their country, downing South African aircraft and capturing some equipment and arms.

24. Incidentally, the valiant FAPLA units and the Angolan People's Defence Organization had succeeded in routing the bandits and puppets supported by the South African armed forces when the latter rushed in their troops and saved their puppets from being wiped out. This is part of an ongoing attempt by the racist régime, an attempt started in 1975, to use military might inside Angolan territory and install a puppet administration in areas under South African military occupation. The White Paper prepared by the Government of Angola details the attempts made in 1975 and 1976.[1] The present operation is part of that plan. In fact, a similar military action by FAPLA in the past almost succeeded in destroying the bandit group, only to have the racist armed forces rush in at the last minute to save their protégés.

25. The Government and the people of Angola are bearing the brunt of the fury unleashed by the racist régime against those whose very existence threatens the racist structure and way of life. For the *apartheid* régime to feel safe inside the borders of South Africa, it feels impelled to exert its hegemony over Africa up to the equator, as is explicitly stated in its amended Defence Laws. Unfortunately, owing to a fact of geography, the independent and sovereign State of Angola stands in the way. Ironically enough, Angola has no border with South Africa. However, since Namibia is ruled as a fifth province by the Pretoria régime, this technicality is not allowed to stand in the way of the racist actions.

26. Every duty carries a corresponding right. Angola, as a State Member of the United Nations, has always discharged its obligations under the Charter. For its part, the Council owes the southern African States some action that will redress the existing military aggression being carried out by the racist South African régime. Despite our bitter experience and despite the recent and ongoing massive military operations, and to deny Pretoria's friends any excuse to point a finger at us, the Government of Angola is willing to test the so-called offer made by the South African régime. After all, 31 January is not too far away.

27. We can understand the Council's reluctance to act in situations where the issue has not been brought to the Council. Neither the Government nor the people of Angola can understand the Council's inability or unwillingness to act when the issue has been before the Council since 1976; when six resolutions have been adopted by the Council itself since 1976 [*resolutions 387 (1976), 428 (1978), 447 (1979), 454 (1979), 475 (1980) and 545 (1983)*]; when there is a clear violation of the Charter; when the Council is the supreme peace-keeping organ of the Organization and the guardian of the Charter; when the will of the international community has been regularly, consistently and unequivocally expressed in support of the Angolan position; when there have been almost 3,000 documented cases of South African aggression against Angola up to mid-1981; when there has been no case of an Angolan soldier ever setting foot across the national borders of Angola; when the known, recognized and internationally acknowledged aggressor strikes with impunity across its own borders; when the members of the Council and States Members of the United Nations acknowledge the validity and justness of the Angolan position and acknowledge and admit the culpability of the racist South African régime—why then, in the face of this universality, is the Council impotent to deliver justice and to safeguard peace and security?

28. Will the aggressor be allowed to go unindicted? Will it be free to continue its racist acts with impunity; free to violate the Charter; free to expand its hegemony over southern Africa and destroy the fragile balance that exists in the region; free to destabilize sovereign Governments in the region; free to sabotage the national reconstruction efforts by independent States; free to carry out State terrorism and acts of armed aggression; free to butcher, rape and kidnap; free to threaten and destroy the livelihood of civilians?

29. As a State Member of the United Nations, a Member in good standing, Angola has the right to demand and the right to expect an answer—an answer that will be acceptable to the people of Angola, whose concerns we present to the Council and whose interests we represent at the United Nations.

30. My delegation waits not merely for another resolution on paper, but for the answer to carry home.

31. *A luta continua! A vitoria è certa!*

32. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Spanish*]: The next speaker is the representative of South Africa,

whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

33. Mr. von SCHIRNDING (South Africa): Sir, on behalf of the South African delegation I should like to convey to you our congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council.

34. In requesting this meeting of the Council, the representative of Angola, in his letter dated 1 January, transmitted a message from the President of Angola to the President of the Security Council in which reference is made to "the worsening military situation in southern Angola created by the advancement of the South African military units further north into Angolan territory" and a wish was expressed to avoid "a situation that would lead to disastrous consequences, which would in turn threaten peace and security in the region".

35. When I last addressed the Council, as recently as 16 December 1983 [*2504th meeting*], I made it clear that South Africa has no desire to control a single centimetre of Angolan territory and that South African security operations in southern Angola have but a single objective, and that is the protection of the inhabitants of South West Africa/Namibia from SWAPO [*South West Africa People's Organization*] terrorist attacks which are launched from Angolan territory.

36. The progressive moves by South African military units to which the President of Angola has referred are being conducted with precisely that objective in view.

37. It is hypocrisy for Angola to come to the Council and to state that it wishes to avoid a situation that would lead to disastrous consequences. It is the actions of the Angolan régime in aiding and abetting SWAPO's terrorist aims and by supporting SWAPO to launch attacks from Angola and maintain bases on Angolan territory which in fact will lead to "disastrous consequences", unless the Luanda régime comes to its senses.

38. South Africa has stated on innumerable occasions that it will not sit idly by while SWAPO operates with impunity from the safety of Angolan territory from where they plan and execute their acts of murder and pillage against the civilians of the Territory of South West Africa/Namibia.

39. It is hypocrisy for Angola to have the effrontery to complain to the Council about the security operations of the South African military forces in the execution of their task to seek out and to destroy SWAPO bases in southern Angola in pre-emptive actions such as the one which is currently under way. South Africa has declared its intentions openly. I have personally stated them in the Council and I repeat them here today.

40. The Luanda régime makes no secret of its support for SWAPO's aims and objectives, and it is also no secret that the forces of the Angolan régime are becoming increasingly integrated with the SWAPO murder gangs for whom they provide facilities and arms and equipment.

41. South Africa has made it clear that it has no quarrel with the military units of the Luanda régime and that its cross-border activities are aimed at eradicating SWAPO nests in Angola. However, we have made it equally clear that if the armed forces of the Angolan régime are bent on giving active military support to SWAPO or interfere with South Africa's operations against SWAPO, then they must bear full responsibility for the consequences. South Africa furthermore denies emphatically that its forces commit atrocities against the civilian population of Angola.

42. If the Luanda régime is so concerned with a threat to peace and security in the region, it should take the necessary steps to ensure that its territory is not used for the launching of aggression against its neighbours.

43. If it is so concerned with the threat to peace and security in the region, as it professes, why does it attempt to justify the presence in Angola of the Cuban and other surrogates, who represent ideologies completely foreign to Africa? Their presence is indeed a threat to peace and security in the region, and is leading Angola to disastrous consequences because the people of Angola refuse to succumb to the tyranny which has been imposed on them with the direct assistance of the Cuban forces.

44. South Africa and, I trust, the members of the Council will not be taken in by this transparent attempt of the Luanda régime at deception. As long as the Angolan régime tolerates, encourages and nourishes SWAPO's gangs of terrorists on its soil, for so long will the South African Defence Force seek out their bases and destroy them.

45. Let me turn now to the letter dated 31 December 1983 which the President of Angola addressed to the Secretary-General [*S/16245*]. It will be recalled that when I addressed the Council on 16 December, I read to the Council the text of the letter dated 15 December from the Minister for Foreign Affairs and Information of South Africa to the Secretary-General, in which the Government of South Africa indicated that it was prepared to begin, on 31 January 1984, a disengagement of forces which from time to time conduct military operations against SWAPO in Angola, on the understanding that this gesture would be reciprocated by the Angolan Government, which would assure that its own forces, SWAPO and the Cubans would not exploit the resulting situation, in particular with regard to actions which might threaten the security of the inhabitants of South West Africa/Namibia [*see S/16219, annex I*].

46. It will be further recalled that Angola's immediate response to this positive gesture on the part of South Africa was one of contemptuous rejection. Apparently that régime has now had second thoughts and must

have been advised that its outright rejection of South Africa's initiative did it more harm than good; hence this attempt by Angola to appear to be reasonable. The Angolan Government is, however, the one which will have to comply with the conditions for peace, not the South African Government.

47. The South African Government's offer still stands. Its language is clear: if Angola desires peace it can have peace by not allowing SWAPO to operate from its territory and by not exploiting any arrangement for the cessation of hostilities. Finally, as regards the implementation of Council resolution 435 (1978), South Africa has stated that it remains prepared to begin the process of implementation upon resolution of the problem of Cuban forces in Angola as reflected in paragraph 12 of the Secretary-General's report of 28 August 1983 [*S/15943*]. That remains South Africa's position.

48. Mr. DIALLO (Upper Volta) [*interpretation from French*]: Mr. President, as this is my first statement in the Council on behalf of the Upper Volta, I wish first of all to convey my country's deep gratitude to all the States Members of the United Nations, by whose decision we have become a member of the Council. They may rest assured that the trust they placed in us will not be betrayed.

49. Permit me next to express to you and to my other colleagues in the Council how much my delegation and I appreciate the warm welcome extended to the new members of the Council. We are certain that this welcome bodes well for close and frank co-operation, as a foundation for our mutual relations and efforts aimed at maintaining international peace and security.

50. I am particularly pleased, Sir, to greet you, the representative of Nicaragua, a country with which the Upper Volta maintains excellent relations of friendship and co-operation. I express my sincere wishes for the success of your tenure as President of the Council and assure you of my delegation's total readiness to co-operate with you to that end.

51. I wish also to pay a well-deserved tribute to your predecessor, who skilfully guided the Council's debates during the month of December.

52. Turning to the situation in Angola, my delegation's position in this debate is based on three essentials points.

53. The first is the contribution which my country, the Upper Volta, considers it should make to the maintenance of international peace and security, not only as a full-fledged Member of the United Nations, but also as a member of the Council. For it is not a question only of the fate of the little State of Angola—which, in the manner of Sisyphus, returns to the Council again and again to recount its misfortunes: international peace and security themselves are at stake.

54. There is no denying the threat posed for the past several years by the warlike acts of the racist régime to both regional and international peace and security. The Council is fully aware of this. For a number of years the international community and, especially, the Council have been passive observers of the many systematic campaigns of destabilization carried out by the racist régime of South Africa against the front-line States.

55. That policy of destabilization has been and still is most obvious in the acts of aggression constantly perpetrated against Angola. It reached its climax when, in August 1981, the troops of the *apartheid* régime carried out a massive invasion of the territory of Angola, occupying certain parts of the south of that country.

56. Thus, history shows that the situation in Angola today is nothing new. It is a situation regarding which the Council, in its resolution 387 (1976), demanded South Africa's respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola; regarding which the Council adopted its resolution 428 (1978), in which it demanded the unconditional withdrawal of the racist armed forces from Angola; and regarding which the Council saw fit to reiterate its appeals in resolutions 447 (1979), 454 (1979) and 475 (1980).

57. The incontestable facts are there abundantly to prove that this situation is a flagrant violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola, a State Member of the United Nations. The incontestable facts are there as a constant reminder to us all of the threat posed by this situation to international peace and security.

58. What is sadly lacking—and this is the second point on which my delegation wishes to reflect—is a political decision made by certain members of the Council, and not the least prominent among them, to make an honest contribution, without machiavellian intrigues, to dissipate that threat forever in the light solely of their heavy responsibility regarding the maintenance of international peace and security. If the Council is today unable to give the world the expected response to this distressing problem, it is particularly because of the support enjoyed by Pretoria from those Powers.

59. The situation in Angola is deteriorating from day to day. Security Council resolution 545 (1983) has not been enough to bring the racist régime into line. Not content with perpetuating its military occupation of some parts of southern Angola, that régime has reached the heights of effrontery by pushing even deeper into the interior of Angolan territory, and the criminal even dares not merely to walk the streets, but to come here to the Council to make further threats against its victim.

60. Given that attitude, we are entitled to wonder whether it will be enough for the Council simply to adopt a resolution during these meetings if things are to change. There is every reason to believe that, no sooner have our voices fallen silent in this chamber than the

acts of aggression will proliferate, the cannon will continue to roar, and sovereignty and territorial integrity will go on being violated.

61. It is clear to my delegation that another condemnation of the Pretoria régime's continued aggression against and occupation of Angola, and a further demand that the South African régime immediately and unconditionally withdraw its troops from Angolan territory will also be inadequate to deal justly with Angola, which, since its accession to independence, has been groaning under the burden of war.

62. My delegation believes that there is something else which can be done, and that is the third point I wish to touch on.

63. The *apartheid* régime's game is obvious. As a pastmaster of sowing confusion, it is trying to distract the attention of the international community from the underlying reasons for its infamy. Clearly, it is trying to make Angola pay for supporting SWAPO in its struggle for the liberation on the Namibian people, a struggle which the General Assembly and the Security Council consider to be a legitimate one.

64. This new dimension in the action of the Council which we are thinking of at the present stage of the situation is firmness. It is high time that the Council stood firm in demanding the strict implementation of its resolutions and decisions. That firmness can be convincing only if all the members in this chamber speak with one voice. We urge them to do this, especially those among them whose attitudes encourage racist South Africa to persist in its violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

65. It is our hope that a clear decision and an unambiguous resolve, particularly on the part of the permanent members of the Council, will induce the racist clique in Pretoria to grasp the fact that the Council expects of it the immediate unconditional and total cessation of its criminal armed attacks against Angola.

66. The Upper Volta, which has always demonstrated its attachment to the cause of peoples struggling for their independence, their territorial integrity and their national sovereignty, is ready at all times to provide its assistance wherever necessary in order to establish this new dimension in our actions.

67. The Upper Volta solemnly reaffirms that we will always be by the side of the fraternal people of Angola in the sacrifices they will have to make in order to continue this war that has been imposed upon them.

68. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Spanish*]: The next speaker is the representative of Togo, who wishes to make a statement as Chairman of the Group of African States at the United Nations for the month of January. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

69. Mr. AMEGA (Togo) [*interpretation from French*]: Taking part in the Council's debate involves a special duty: that of thanking the members of the Council for giving me this opportunity to take part in their work. As this is the outset of the new year, I extend my best wishes for the New Year to one and all.

70. I should also like to congratulate the representatives of Egypt, India, Peru, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Upper Volta on their admission to the Council. I am convinced that, as they exercise their responsibilities in the maintenance of peace, they will share their experience and their faith in this United Nations forum with others, as did the representatives of those countries whose term has just expired.

71. Mr. President, my delegation knows that, in addition to your great human qualities and your qualities as a diplomat, you have faith in the Council. That is why we are convinced that under your stewardship the Council's work will be positive, as indeed it was last month.

72. I am pleased to congratulate once again Mr. van der Stoel, the representative of the Netherlands, on the dedicated, expert and wise manner in which he conducted the proceedings of the Council last month.

73. I should like to extend a welcome to Mr. Hama Arba Diallo, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Upper Volta, who has by his presence here been kind enough to express the importance his country attaches to the item under consideration.

74. I am taking part in this debate in the Council on the situation in Angola as Chairman of the Group of African States at the United Nations for January and as representative of my country to express faith in the Organization at a time when, for the second time in two weeks, the Council has to consider the violation of the fundamental rights of one of the Members of the Organization, Angola. Angola's complaint, coming as it does so soon on the heels on the last complaint, proceeds from the faith that country has had in the Organization since its accession to independence in 1975, convinced, as it is, that the United Nations will succeed in forcing the Pretoria régime to cease its acts of violation. Since 1948, that régime has desperately tried to maintain racist control over 22 million blacks, the genuine inhabitants of the country, by resorting to the most abject means, going beyond the boundaries of morality and law. In the circumstances, nothing seems to stop the illegal racist *apartheid* régime. It uses torture, imprisonment and mass executions of freedom fighters and defenceless women, children and old persons, and it persecutes representatives of religious organisations. It has set up a system of subversion, terrorism and aggression against neighbouring countries, in particular Angola, whose complaint is the subject of the present debate.

75. It will be recalled that, on 20 December 1983, the Council adopted its resolution 545 (1983), in which it

strongly condemned "South Africa's continued military occupation of parts of southern Angola which constitutes a flagrant violation of international law and of the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola", declared that "the continued illegal military occupation of the territory of Angola is a flagrant violation of the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Angola and endangers international peace and security, and demanded that "South Africa should unconditionally withdraw forthwith all its occupation forces from the territory of Angola and cease all violations against that State and henceforth scrupulously respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola."

76. That resolution expresses the feelings of the Council in December 1983, showing that they have not changed since 1976, seven years earlier, as is borne out by resolutions 387 (1976), 428 (1978), 447 (1979), 454 (1979) and 475 (1980). Furthermore, the Council, impatient with the stubbornness of the racist South African régime, has once again called on all States to implement fully the arms embargo imposed against South Africa in Security Council resolution 418 (1977).

77. What has happened since 20 December? Why is there need for a further meeting of the Council? On 17 December, it might have been thought that the Council's debate would have satisfied everyone, but now the South African ogre has once again bared its fangs and its claws and taken a heavy toll on the martyred people of Angola. Not only have the efforts of the Council been flouted, but the will of the international community has been completely disregarded. The unlawful Government of South Africa has, as is its wont, ignored resolution 545 (1983) by again bombing the territory of Angola. Furthermore, that Government has now made its untrustworthiness abundantly clear by violating the commitments it unilaterally and freely entered into in its letter of 15 December addressed to the Secretary-General, in which it stated that it was "prepared to begin a disengagement of forces which from time to time conduct military operations against SWAPO in Angola, on 31 January 1984" [*see S/16219, annex I*]. As far as disengagement is concerned, we are now witnessing further acts of reprisal and repression just committed by the South African régime against Angola. Once again human lives have been lost, property has been destroyed, initiatives have perished and hopes have been dashed.

78. People in Africa are wondering how far the South African racists plan to go. It is clear and certain that even with its vast modern means of destruction and murder the racist régime of South Africa cannot pride itself on its ability to overcome national liberation movements. History teaches us that nothing can prevail over an oppressed people, for right is on its side. We in Africa are therefore convinced that time is working in favour of the oppressed black people of Azania. It is high time to move to the negotiating table, for, as the editorial writer Bechir Ben Yahmed stated in *Jeune Afrique*, Nos. 1199 and 1200, of 28 December 1983 and 4 January 1984, "in the year 2000 there will be 27 million oppressed people against 5 million whites, and then the only real question will be: where will all those blacks go? In short, where can they be put?"

79. Returning to the situation in Angola, the subject of the Council's present debate, I should like, on behalf of my colleagues in the Group of African States, to invite the Council at the conclusion of this debate to adopt a draft resolution whose basic elements would be an immediate cease-fire and the unconditional withdrawal of South African troops from Angola. In our opinion, the Council must once again condemn South Africa's hostile acts against Angola and order that they be stopped. The Council must also once again reject "linkage". On behalf of my colleagues in the Group of African States, I express the hope that the new year will inspire the Council so that, in the face of situations like the one currently before it, its members will join their efforts in order to strengthen the Council's effectiveness and credibility. Such efforts must include the exercise of unanimous and increased pressure against the racist South African régime to force it to abandon its policy of aggression against and violation of the territorial integrity of its neighbours. The time is more propitious than ever for bringing about a meeting of minds.

80. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Spanish*]: The next speaker is the representative of India, who wishes to make a statement in his capacity as representative of the Chairperson of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

81. Mr. VERMA (India): I should like, Sir, to begin by greeting you and offering you our felicitations as you accede to the presidency of the Council at the outset of the new year. We hope this year will bring peace, amity and goodwill and draw us away from confrontation and from the precipice of conflict. We are confident that with your wisdom, objectivity and experience you will impart vigour and a sense of purpose to the Council's deliberations in 1984. Although, of course, my country was not a member of the Council last month, I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate the representative of the Netherlands on the manner in which he conducted the business of the Council during the previous month.

82. I should also like to thank you for the very warm words of welcome which you have addressed to my delegation, among others, on our assumption of membership of the Council. We congratulate the other new members. My delegation looks forward to working closely in co-operation with our colleagues in the exercise of our common responsibilities and in the promotion of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

83. Finally, to you and to all our colleagues on the Council, we extend our best wishes for the New Year.

84. India has the privilege to return to the Council after a lapse of six years, and we are grateful to all those countries that have made this possible. We are conscious of the confidence that has been reposed in us, and it shall be our endeavour to vindicate that trust to the best of our conviction and ability. India's commitment to the United Nations and to the Charter is well known. As the Prime Minister of India, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, stated in her address to the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly:

> "Today, because of the unique authority entrusted to it in controlling military crises through its instruments and its influence on social and economic developments through its various specialized agencies, the United Nations is an integral part of the lives of nations and individuals."[2]

Thirty years earlier, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru had observed that the United Nations represented "the timeless urge of humanity for peace". My delegation's participation in the work of the Council shall be rooted in its firm and abiding commitment to the Charter and conviction in its principles.

85. Though this is the fifth time that India is serving on the Council, the present occasion acquires for us a special character. That is so because we also concurrently have the honour to serve as Chairman of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries. Thus, though I represent my Government, I cannot but be deeply conscious of the larger mantle of responsibility which we bear. We are happy that there are three other non-aligned countries among the new members of the Council. We recall the support which the non-aligned have always extended to the United Nations and the Charter. As the Prime Minister of India and Chairperson of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, stated to the thirty-eighth session of the General Assembly:

> "Firm faith in the United Nations is central to the non-aligned. All members of the Non-Aligned Movement are members, current or potential, of the United Nations. However, the United Nations is an institution, the non-aligned group a movement. ... But the aim is the same: to maintain peace by removing the sources of tension and to bring out the humanity in human beings."[3]

86. It was scarcely two weeks ago [*2508th meeting*] that the Council pronounced itself once again on South Africa's continued aggression against and illegal occupation of parts of Angolan territory by adopting resolution 545 (1983). That resolution, *inter alia*, strongly condemned "South Africa's continued military occupation of parts of southern Angola," deemed that this constituted "a flagrant violation of the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Angola" and endangered international peace and security, and demanded "that South Africa ... unconditionally withdraw forthwith all its occupation forces from the territory of Angola and cease all violations against the State and henceforth scrupulously respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola".

87. Those pronouncements of the Council were clear and unequivocal and reflected the will of the Council and indeed of the entire international community. Yet, how did South Africa respond? By launching the largest offensive into Angolan territory since 1981, by advancing deeper than 200 kilometres into the territory of that sovereign State, and by inflicting fresh loss of human life and further large-scale damage to the Angolan economy. In other words, South Africa has remained true to its reputation by arrogantly defying the verdict of the Council yet again, even before the ink was dry on resolution 545 (1983).

88. The representative of Angola has apprised the Council of the details of the latest in the series of Pretoria's unceasing acts of aggression. Over the past few days we have seen also reports in the press about the massive South African offensive, professedly launched on the old and familiar pretext of so-called hot pursuit of SWAPO freedom fighters and sought to be justified on the alleged ground of an imminent SWAPO offensive into occupied Namibia. That pretext of "hot pursuit" —or of so-called pre-emptive strikes—that the representative of South Africa has just presented to the Council stands long discredited and exposed. South Africa has no business to be in Namibia, in the first place. Pretoria has repeatedly used Namibian territory as a spring-board for launching acts of aggression, destabilization and terrorism against independent African States in an effort to consolidate its illegitimate presence in Namibia and to further its exploitation of the human and material resources of that Territory. Furthermore, while the right of the Namibian people, led by their sole and authentic representative, SWAPO, to achieve their independence by every means at their disposal has been acclaimed by the international community, SWAPO has distinguished itself by its flexibility and willingness to negotiate.

89. What the Council is considering today is therefore yet another instance of unabashed aggression against an independent African State: Angola. What we are faced with is a situation in which Pretoria's forces have again struck over 200 kilometres deep inside Angolan territory and have had to be engaged in combat by Angolan defence units in the localities of Cuvelai, Mulondo, Cahama, Cassinga and Caiundo. Angola has again felt compelled to come to the Council with the plaint that its sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity are being trampled upon by South Africa. Let us not therefore be taken in by South Africa's arguments and diversionary manoeuvres but squarely face the real issue before us.

90. When my delegation addressed the Council on 16 December 1983 on the item before us [*2504th meeting*], we had occasion to refer *in extenso* to the firm and principled support that the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has always extended to

Angola, a fellow member of the Movement. There is no need for me therefore to repeat the pronouncements made by the Movement in this regard. Suffice it to reiterate that the Movement has deemed the occupation of Angolan territory by forces of the racist régime as an act of aggression against the Movement itself. We also apprised the Council in the same statement of the position of the Commonwealth and, of course, India's own steadfast solidarity with the Government and people of Angola and support for that country's sovereignty and territorial integrity.

91. My delegation has learnt with interest of the proposal separately made by the President of Angola, in his letter to the Secretary-General of 31 December 1983 [*S/16245*], expressing Angola's willingness to observe a 30-day truce, with effect from 31 January 1984, provided certain crucial conditions are met. We believe that to be a positive and constructive proposal which deserves careful consideration by all concerned. We understand that the Secretary-General is in direct touch with the concerned parties and we look forward to hearing from him on the outcome of his consultations.

92. Be that as it may, the Council needs to address itself more urgently to the issue at hand, namely, the latest massive act of aggression by Pretoria against Angola and to South Africa's persistent intransigence. We believe that the Council must condemn those actions in the strongest terms and demand respect for Angola's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity. The Council must ensure, by every means available under the Charter, that South Africa respects the will of the Council by withdrawing immediately and unconditionally from Angola. The situation in southern Africa, which has been volatile at the best of times on account of Pretoria's policies, has acquired even greater seriousness as a result of the latest South African aggression against Angola, threatening regional and international peace and security. It is high time that the Council acted firmly and effectively to rectify the situation. My delegation remains ready to extend its support to all efforts in this direction.

93. Mr. KHALIL (Egypt) [*interpretation from Arabic*]: Allow me to begin by congratulating you, Sir, on your accession to the presidency of the Council for the month of January, the beginning of a new year, with all the hope it brings. We are confident that your well-known diplomatic experience and wisdom will be of great assistance to the Council in successfully carrying out the tasks entrusted to it.

94. I should like also to congratulate and thank your predecessor, Mr. Max van der Stoel, the representative of the Netherlands, President of the Council for the month of December, for the diplomatic skills he displayed in conducting the Council's work.

95. I especially appreciate the kind words with which you, Mr. President, welcomed my country's accession to membership of the Council. It is a great honour for my country, as well as for my delegation, to be a member of the Council for the next two years, after a long absence. Egypt fully appreciates the great responsibilities entailed by this membership. I assure the Council that we will spare no efforts in carrying out those responsibilities, drawing on the experience of our predecessors in the Council and the relations of friendship and co-operation that we enjoy with all its members.

96. Only two weeks have elapsed since the Council concluded discussion of a complaint brought by Angola against South Africa because of the latter's occupation of parts of Angolan territory [*2504th to 2508th meetings*]. In its resolution 545 (1983), the Council condemned South Africa's continued military occupation of parts of Angola which constitutes a flagrant violation of international law and of the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola. The Council demanded that South Africa should unconditionally withdraw forthwith from the territory of Angola.

97. However, South Africa as usual did not stop at disregarding the provisions of the aforementioned resolution. Instead, as of 15 December 1983 it has escalated its military operations inside Angola and has mobilized large numbers of its armed forces and air force to attack positions 200 kilometres and more inside Angolan territory. To this end it has used its air force to attack positions and towns, many of which are deep inside Angola. This has led to a further loss of lives and destruction of property, as is clearly stated in the annex to the letter addressed to the Secretary-General by the President of Angola [*see S/16245*] as the representative of Angola explained to us in an emotional but factual way. Needless to say, losses are mounting every day owing to the continuing aggression of the racist régime of Pretoria and the escalation of its actions.

98. The delegation of Egypt, in its statement before the Council on 20 December in the course of the debate on Angola's complaint against South Africa [*2507th meeting*], plainly said that Angola does not represent a security threat to South Africa, as the latter claims in seeking to justify its continuing aggression. The contrary is true. The latest acts of aggression by South Africa provide additional proof, if the international community still needed such proof, that Angola is the one needing to have its security protected against the continuing aggression of South Africa since 1976, aggression in which South Africa exploits its great military superiority, which allows it to attack positions deep inside Angola, as is happening now.

99. The current situation, which is the result of South Africa's escalating aggression against Angola, adds new dimensions to the deteriorating situation in the region. By its resolution 545 (1983), the Council attempted to preserve international peace and security; yet once again this matter brings before the Council its basic responsibilities.

100. The delegation of Egypt believes that the Council, in addition to demanding that the racist régime of Pretoria immediately cease its armed aggression, withdraw its troops from Angola and desist from further air raids, must, in the light of that régime's disregard for Council resolutions, consider implementing the relevant provisions provided by the Charter of the United Nations. Faced today with flagrant defiance on the part of the racist régime of South Africa, the Council must act appropriately to enforce implementation of its resolutions.

101. Mr. ARIAS STELLA (Peru) [*interpretation from Spanish*]: First of all, I should like to extend to you my personal congratulations, Sir, and those of my delegation on your assumption of the presidency for this month. As a Latin American and representative of a nation that shares traditional bonds of friendship and co-operation with your own country, I fervently hope that under your wise leadership our work will be entirely successful. I also thank you for your words of welcome to those countries which are joining the Council today.

102. Also on behalf of the delegation of Peru, I should like to express congratulations and thanks to the representative of the Netherlands on the effective manner in which he carried out his duties last month.

103. Peru is now beginning its participation as a non-permanent member of the Council, and I should like most sincerely and cordially to extend greetings to all the members of the Council and to the Secretary-General. Here and now I can pledge the full co-operation of the Government of Peru as we strive in this body to discharge our duties and responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations.

104. The item before us today is no stranger to the urgent questions of great concern to the international community. It has been on the agenda of the Council for nearly a decade and has been considered and debated at length. A number of resolutions have been adopted on it, although their binding provisions have regrettably not been carried out. Barely two weeks ago [*2508th meeting*] the Council unanimously adopted its most recent resolution, namely resolution 545 (1983).

105. As soon as it became an independent country, a sizable portion of Angola was invaded and occupied by military forces from South Africa. That occupation continues today, in violation of the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola. In defence of the principles of the Charter and of the norms of international law, Peru rejects the use of force by South Africa against the people and Government of Angola and the intensification of hostilities in recent days.

106. The situation today is particularly delicate in view of the fact that the continuing military operations against that country are being carried out from the Territory of Namibia, which also has been unlawfully occupied and administered by South Africa in a further violation in defiance of the authority of the Council and of the international community.

107. In view of the deterioration of the situation in southern Angola, which further aggravates the chronic instability of that part of the continent and endangers international peace and security, as referred to in the request for a meeting by the Council contained in document S/16244 of 1 January, the Council has an obligation to take an unequivocal stand.

108. In the opinion of my delegation, the decision to be adopted should contain three main elements, the nucleus of the question before us: rejection of South Africa's armed aggression, an immediate cessation of hostilities and the earliest possible withdrawal of foreign invading and occupying forces.

109. In connection with the proposal put forward by the President of Angola to create the necessary conditions for an early settlement of the question of Namibia, in keeping with the plan agreed to by the United Nations, and which appears in document S/16245, my delegation supports the representations being made by the Secretary-General and expresses the hope that these efforts will lead to success.

110. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Spanish*]: The next speaker is the representative of Mozambique. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

111. Mr. Dos SANTOS (Mozambique): Mr. President, I wish on behalf of my delegation to thank you and the members of the Council for giving me this opportunity to participate in the deliberations on the question of racist South African aggression against the sister Republic of Angola. I am confident that your long and rich experience will be brought to bear upon the Council and will successfully guide it during this month.

112. You know the full meaning of what foreign aggression means, of what dictatorship means, of what it means in human suffering, deprivation and degradation and of the price to be paid to rid oneself of imperialist aggression in order to gain and attain independence and defend sovereignty and territorial integrity. Nicaragua and Mozambique share this common bitter experience. Angola, just like Nicaragua, is going through a difficult period for its people.

113. May I pay a very special tribute to the person who preceded you in the presidency, the representative of the Netherlands. Similarly, I wish warmly to greet and congratulate the new members.

114. Not long ago—about two weeks, to be more exact—the Angolan people and their Government sought the assistance of the international community, through the Council, in their quest to persuade the racist South Africans to withdraw their forces of

aggression [*2504th to 2508th meetings*]. The aggression was condemned and the *apartheid* forces of aggression were enjoined to withdraw unconditionally and forthwith. That was only two weeks ago.

115. Now the Angolan people and Government are forced by circumstances to seek help from the Council. This is only normal and natural, for the Council bears the primary responsibility for upholding and defending the purposes and principles of the United Nations. Although they are all well known, it seems to me that we should remind ourselves of them from time to time.

116. They are: first, to maintain international peace and security, and, to that end, to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace; secondly, to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace.

117. This peace has eluded the Angolan people for the last five centuries. Under Portuguese colonial rule —and variously known as "colony", "State", back to "colony" again, "overseas province" and back to "State" again—they were suppressed and repressed until 1975. With the defeat of the Portuguese colonialists, the racist South Africans sent their tanks, artillery, armoured vehicles and personnel carriers into Angola in 1975.

118. Ignominiously defeated in their turn, they retreated from Angolan territory in 1976. Because they could not count on their major ally from 1976 onwards, the racists relied mainly on bands of Angolan traitors to harass Angola. But once assured of that support again, the Boers again sent their murderous forces and other mercenaries into southern Angola in 1981 and they have been there ever since, sowing death and wanton destruction and bringing untold deprivation, sorrow and suffering to the Angolan people. Economic infrastructures such as roads, bridges and dams are being destroyed, factories are being razed to the ground and whole towns wiped out. Defenceless civilians, including the elderly, women and children, are being mercilessly cut down by the advancing bloodthirsty columns.

119. It has become a habit of racist South Africans and common knowledge of the international community that, whenever there is significant movement towards peace and a peaceful settlement of the Namibian independence question in particular, or peace in southern Africa in general, or the question of racist South African aggression against Angola, the Boers resort to limitless subterfuge and deception, as well as to giving false promises and assurances to the international community.

120. Two weeks ago, the Council was treated to that well-known, time-tested and time-honoured traditional dish that constitutes the prime pride of the Boers. That dish was given the fancy name of disengagement, the ingredients of which were carefully guarded in a vain attempt to dupe the peace-loving international community. It deceived no one, much less the Council, except of course those few who are ever ready, for reasons best known to themselves only, to grab the tiniest straw, just as a drowning person does, or a child who is ever eager to lay its hands on any candy or anything resembling it, however remote the resemblance might be. Disengagement does not necessarily mean cease-fire. It definitely does not mean withdrawal of troops. At the time the so-called disengagement deceit was offered, the racist forces of aggression were intensifying their bombings against innocent civilians, butchering defenceless women and children, expanding their military operations to new areas, moving deeper and deeper into Angolan territory and spreading their heinous crimes.

121. Today there are no signs of South Africa's compliance with resolution 545 (1983) and other relevant Council resolutions, nor of the so-called disengagement. On the contrary, racist South Africa has increased its forces of aggression occupying much of southern Angola to three mechanized infantry brigades, four 140-mm and 155-mm artillery units, two paratrooper batallions, tanks and other armoured personnel carriers and assault vehicles. About 100 warplanes and helicopters were thrown into the battle. In recent days, the towns of Cahama, Cuvelai, Mulondo, Cassinga and Caiundo came under increasing, intensified and barbarous attacks. As a matter of fact, the latest acts of aggression are the most extensive and brutal in the last two years. Is this disengagement? I do not know what disengagement means in Afrikaans, but in English, according to my limited knowledge, this cannot be termed disengagement: this is engagement; this is unprovoked and naked aggression. Of course, I am not going to engage in semantics. I leave it up to my good friend the representative of the United Kingdom to clarify the situation. This is Shakespearean language, not Bantu language.

122. In my last address to the Council on the same subject I had this to say when referring to the racist South Africans:

> "They are hardened, perpetual offenders. Their behaviour can be likened to that of a hardened, callous criminal who does not feel comfortable outside the prison walls. He feels so uncomfortable that as his person term approaches its end he becomes very restless and begins plotting and designing the next crime. No sooner is he released than he commits another crime, and he is back in prison.

"Let us face the facts, however hard, unpalatable and ugly they may be. The racist clique in Pretoria is composed of hardened, unrepentant criminals who are no different from other well-known international organized crime groups, except perhaps that they have organized something resembling and having the appearance of Government—when taken at face value, that is. In reality South Africa is run by a masonic house known as the *broederbond*." [*2506th meeting, paras. 142 and 143.*]

123. Recent events in South Africa, Namibia and Angola have not proved me wrong. However, I harbour a deep, sincere and ardent hope that time may prove me wrong. I would not mind at all.

124. What racist South Africa wants is peace South African style. It wants to create a universe of its own, a constellation where it will be the star, while others gravitate around that *apartheid* sun. It wants a world where Lesotho and Swaziland will be the homelands, Botswana and Mozambique will be the Ciskei, Zambia and Zimbabwe will be the Venda, Angola and Namibia will be the Bantustan, Seychelles and Tanzania will be the Bophuthatswana.

125. The Council and the West bear a great responsibility. The latter has to make a choice of either continuing, by deeds or silence, to encourage racist South Africa to or dissuade it from thinking of itself as the last citadel of white-minority rule in Africa, billed as virtually impregnable, an industrial fortress ringed by the most modern weapons.

126. We should not lose sight of what happened in Iran where the Shah played the same role. Racist South Africa is a giant in Africa, but with clay feet. The West has to decide whether it wants to arrest the present violence and allow genuine independence or whether it prefers to continue to allow its finances and expertise to be used to perpetuate racism and *apartheid*, to prolong the violence and bring about a bloodbath.

127. The Council has two choices to make: either it declares that it is satisfied with racist South Africa's behaviour and encourages it to continue to flout the purposes and principles of the United Nations embodied in the Charter, or it will take the necessary measures to force it to respect international law and practice, namely, through the imposition of sanctions. I have no doubt that the Council will not take the first course of action; we shall see whether it is ready to take the second. It is high time that racist South Africa were told in no uncertain terms that the world is in the last years of the twentieth century and not in the dark days of the Middle Ages.

128. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Spanish*]: The next speaker is the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

129. Mr. RUPIA (United Republic of Tanzania): Mr. President, I am grateful to you and to the other members of the Council for allowing my delegation to take part in this urgent debate. I wish you all therefore a prosperous new year. Allow me, Sir, to congratulate you personally on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month.

130. Allow me also to congratulate Mr. van der Stoel, representative of the Netherlands for the exemplary manner in which he conducted the affairs of the Council for the month of December.

131. Just two weeks ago the Council met to consider the continued occupation of parts of the territory of Angola by the *apartheid* régime of South Africa. In adopting resolution 545 (1983), the Council was cognizant of both the tragic consequences of that occupation and the need to fulfil its responsibility of ensuring that Member States of the Organization act in accordance with the Charter. Accordingly, the Council was categorical in condemning South Africa's military occupation of Angola as constituting a flagrant violation of international law and of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of Angola. At the same time, the Council declared that the continued occupation of Angolan territory by the *apartheid* régime endangers international peace and security. Consequently, the Council demanded that South Africa unconditionally withdraw its forces and undertake scrupulously to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Angola.

132. Hardly two weeks later, however, the Government of Angola has been compelled to bring its case to the Council again. The *apartheid* régime has chosen to respond to the call of the Council with bombings of the towns of Cahama, Cuvelai, Caiundo, Kassinga and Mulondo. With a force estimated at over 10,000 troops the *apartheid* régime is attacking more villages and towns. As pointed out by the representative of Angola, the *apartheid* régime has attacked areas as far as 200 kilometres inside Angola. The human and material toll of this new wave of attacks complementing the aggression resulting from the ongoing occupation is again said to be very heavy.

133. The Council has before it a case of continuing aggression against a sovereign, independent, peace-loving Member of the United Nations. The situation prevailing in southern Angola today needs no further elaboration. The Council has already pronounced itself on it. But what is, perhaps, important is to look at this new campaign of aggression and to understand what it means.

134. By launching these renewed acts of aggression even before the ink was dry on a resolution of the Council calling upon it to cease its acts of aggression, the *apartheid* régime has yet again demonstrated, with characteristic arrogance, absolute contempt for the resolutions of this body. At the same time, this cam-

paign provides further proof that South Africa does not intend to abandon its aggressive militaristic policies in the region unless compelled to do so. Therefore, if some members of the Council or other friends of South Africa need further proof of the *apartheid* régime's lawlessness, let them look no further.

135. What we discern in the latest campaign of aggression against Angola is a continuation of a larger conspiracy. This campaign, in both its characteristics and its magnitude, seeks to achieve the same objectives which were resoundingly thwarted in 1975 by the gallant forces of the People's Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA). South Africa has pursued an active policy of open hostility and aggression aimed at crippling the Angolan revolution. Yet these incessant attacks and acts of destabilization and aggression, including the infamous Operation Protea, which resulted in the ongoing occupation of parts of southern Angola, have not daunted the people of Angola in their resolve to resist the racist aggression. Now the *apartheid* régime seems to have launched what it hopes will be the final offensive solution resulting in the bantustanization of Angola; for if it succeeds, not only will the *apartheid* régime have managed to cripple the MPLA Government, but it will also have dealt a deadly blow to the independence of Namibia.

136. The objectives are the same also with regard to the other neighbouring independent African States. The excuse of operations by SWAPO or the African National Congress of South Africa (ANC) is only a smoke-screen to cloak the larger ambitions of the *apartheid* régime. This new wave of aggression against Angola—like those to which Botswana, Lesotho, Mozambique, Zambia and Zimbabwe have been subjected in the past—are part of *apartheid*'s grand design to terrorize, subvert, destabilize and strike its neighbours into total submission, thus—according to South Africa's reasoning—making the region safe for *apartheid*. This objective will be pursued whether or not there are Namibian or South African refugees in those countries. If that were not true, on might ask, why is Seychelles, for example, a target of the *apartheid* régime? Was the mercenary attack against that defenceless island nation also directed against ANC or SWAPO combatants?

137. A corollary of this conspiracy is the unending campaign of the so-called creation of new facts. This is a scheme whose genesis goes beyond even the *apartheid* régime itself. It is an attempt to present the international community, and Angola in particular, with *faits accomplis*. Yesterday we were presented with the linkage of the independence of Namibia to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola; today it is the withdrawal of South African invading troops—which are in perpetual aggression against Angola—which is being linked to the question of the Cuban troops. An attempt is even being made to relegate the priority question of Namibia to secondary importance.

138. The Council too seems incapable of acting, as the implementation of its resolutions is held hostage to the illegal demands of the *apartheid* régime. Today, it is those demands; tomorrow, the countries of the region will be occupied and told that unless they sign treaties of non-aggression South Africa will not withdraw. Clearly there is no end to these *apartheid* demands; and those who are so anxious to appease that régime know the dangers of this.

139. Like other acts of aggression committed by the racist régime in the past, this new campaign is neither isolated nor random. Rather, it forms part of a clear pattern, well timed to coincide with long-contemplated objectives of the *apartheid* régime. The history of United Nations dealings with the *apartheid* régime speaks for itself. Every action of the international community attempting to censure the *apartheid* régime of South Africa or to find a peaceful solution to any of the problems in southern Africa has been reciprocated with an act of aggression by the *apartheid* régime.

140. It was not by coincidence that the Kassinga massacre in 1978 coincided with the adoption of Council resolution 435 (1978). The Cumato offensive was timed to coincide with the wrecking of the pre-implementation meeting at Geneva in January 1981. The Maseru raid in December 1982 was aimed at diverting the attention of the international community from South Africa's occupation of Angola and its obstruction of the implementation of resolution 435 (1978), especially after the conclusion of the proximity talks held here in New York in the middle of the same year. Only last May, the Maputo raid was launched to disrupt the Council debate on the fate of resolution 435 (1978), and as recently as two weeks ago, the empty pronouncements on a so-called disengagement of troops had the purpose of splitting the international community and diverting attention from the occupation of Angolan territory. And now the *apartheid* régime has launched another campaign, timed to coincide with the issuance of the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of resolution 539 (1983) [*S/16237*].

141. Thus, there are before the Council four very important questions affecting southern Africa. First, there are the continuing acts of aggression against the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of a Member State of the Organization. Secondly, there is the illegal occupation by South Africa of the international Territory of Namibia, over which the United Nations has assumed legal control. Thirdly, there is the question of *apartheid*, which is, after all, at the core of the problem in southern Africa. And, fourthly, there is the future of other independent African countries in the region, whose future security hinges on the resolve of the Council to take effective action against the lawlessness of the *apartheid* régime. We have maintained that *apartheid* South Africa is the problem and is the only obstacle to peace in southern Africa. The record of that régime testifies to the correctness of this position. It is the position of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), of the General Assembly, of the Non-Aligned Movement and of the international community as a

whole. We therefore expect the Council to echo that position.

142. As we have said before, it is not the intention of any delegation to ask of the Council more than we believe is the right of Angola. Only two weeks ago [*2505th meeting*] we made the same appeal. Angola, as a State Member of the Organization, is entitled to and must be granted protection by the Council. It is clear that the magnitude and intensity of the ongoing acts of aggression directly threaten its existence. The Council, being the guarantor of international peace and security, therefore has the duty to ensure that Angola continues to exist as an independent, sovereign and secure State. That is the primary responsibility of the Council.

143. We seek from the Council a categorical condemnation of the South African aggression, a demand for the cessation of its acts of aggression and the unconditional withdrawal of the *apartheid* occupation forces from Angola. Equally, the payment of prompt and adequate compensation by South Africa for the damage to human life and property brought about by its aggression must be demanded. Moreover, the Council must leave it in no doubt that if South Africa persists in its aggression the Council will have to consider the adoption of effective measures under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

144. The Council must reaffirm the rights of States under the Charter. Accordingly we also ask the Council to reaffirm the right of Angola to take all measures necessary under the Charter, in particular Article 51, to safeguard its sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence.

145. For its part, Tanzania will unreservedly support any measures taken by the Government of Angola, whether now or in the future, when Angola is faced with such acts of aggression. We believe this is also consistent with the position taken by the OAU.

146. The PRESIDENT [*interpretation from Spanish*]: I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to document S/16247, containing the text of a draft resolution proposed by Angola, Egypt, India, Mozambique, Nicaragua, the United Republic of Tanzania, the Upper Volta, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.

NOTES

[1] ***White Paper on Acts of Aggression by the Racist South African Régime against the People's Republic of Angola 1975-1982***. This document has not been reproduced; it may be consulted in the files of the Secretariat (S/16198, annex).

[2] ***Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-eighth Session, Plenary Meetings***, 9th meeting, para. 17.

[3] ***Ibid.***, para. 5.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00300 90-61313—January 1993—2,050